DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 508 CG 027 847

AUTHOR Cox, Pamela
TITLE State-Sponsored Citizens? Delinquent Girls and Certified Schools in Britain 1900-33.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997). Paper appears in AERA Program under title, "Punitive Pedagogies and Potential Citizens: Girls, Delinquency and Education in Britain, 1900-1933."
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Children; *Citizenship; *Delinquency; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *Females; Foreign Countries; Job Training; Juvenile Justice; Secondary School Students; *Sex Bias; Sex Discrimination; *Sex Stereotypes; Vocational Training Centers
IDENTIFIERS Great Britain

ABSTRACT

Ideas of proper citizenship were, and remain, central to the juvenile justice system. The experiences of a particular group of delinquent and neglected children who were withdrawn or excluded from mainstream elementary education in the early 20th century and sent to reformatory schools is described in this paper. The focus is on two areas of citizenship: the promotion of citizenship as a means of social control, and children's rights as citizens. It explores the way in which citizenship was negotiated for delinquent and neglected girls at a time when traditional concepts of domesticity and femininity were being challenged. During this period, three constructions of citizenship prevailed. The first two, the teaching of formal civics and an emphasis upon social action, had developed in the 19th century, whereas welfare citizenship was a product of early 20th century social legislation. In all three constructions, the development of industrial schools and the right to be rescued were influenced by gender. Girls' training was dominated by domestic work and, subsequently, boys, who did not face such restrictions, were placed in a much wider range of jobs than were girls. The experiences of girls within the schools show how restricted notions of female citizenship were used to justify their limited training. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 409 508

State-sponsored citizens? Delinquent girls and certified schools in Britain 1900-33*

Pamela Cox
University of Cambridge

AERA March 97
Division F History and Historiography

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Cox
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

Ideas of proper citizenship were, and remain, central to the juvenile justice system. What kinds of citizens emerged from that system in the early part of this century? This paper discusses the experiences of a particular group of delinquent and neglected children who were withdrawn or excluded from mainstream elementary education in the early 20th century and sent either by magistrates or as voluntary cases to industrial and reformatory schools. These institutions, known collectively as certified schools, aimed to reclaim these children for citizenship.

Histories of British juvenile justice (see esp V Bailey *Delinquency and Citizenship 1914-48* 1987) depend upon a partial concept of 'citizenship' which is relevant only to the experience of boys, and which ignores the impact of class, race and gender upon constructs of 'the citizen'. Defining and promoting citizenship for girls in the early 20th century was problematic. During this period there were three dominant constructions of citizenship. The first two, the teaching of formal civics and an emphasis upon social action, had developed in the 19th century. Welfare citizenship, however, was a product of early 20th century social legislation. Juvenile justice reform was one key manifestation of state-sponsored citizenship. This paper explores the way in which citizenship was negotiated for delinquent and neglected girls at a time when the 'modern' girl was challenging traditional concepts of domesticity and femininity.

*NB - this paper appears in the AERA Program under a slightly different title, 'Punitive pedagogies and potential citizens: girls, delinquency and education in Britain, 1900-1933'. The content remains unchanged.

CG027847

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State-sponsored citizens? Delinquent girls and certified schools in Britain 1900-33

Pamela Cox

AERA March 97

Division F History and Historiography

Please do not cite without author's permission [pmc1004@cus.cam.ac.uk]

Introduction

This paper focuses on two areas of citizenship which are often neglected by historians and social theorists; the promotion of citizenship as a means of social control and children's rights as citizens. As Stephen Heathorn suggests, citizenship referred to rights and duties, although much more historical attention has been paid to the latter.[1] I will explore these themes by examining children's experience of the British juvenile justice system in the period 1900 to the 1940s.[2]

Social control strategies within social citizenship

Following TH Marshall's classic analysis of citizenship, social citizenship has been defined as distinct from political citizenship, which relates to the right to participate in political processes, and distinct from civic citizenship, which relates to the legal or civil rights necessary for social freedom. Social citizenship relates to what might be described as the right to share prevailing standards of life. It outlines a minimum economic standard of living, which, from the late 19th century, increasingly became seen as the state's responsibility to deliver. Social policy was seen to be able to deliver social rights.

On the surface, social citizenship appears to be a positive phenomenon. However, there are clear possibilities for social control implicit within it - possibilities ignored by Marshall in the 1950s and by many communitarians in the 1990s. Within Marshall's model, people should be aware of their social rights and should act upon them. If they are not aware of their rights, then they must be made aware. Failure to appreciate entitlements to social rights undermines citizenship. The coercive elements here are already apparent, and though not problematised by Marshall, have led many historians and theorists to criticise the extent to which social policy can deliver social rights.[3]

Historians of class and crime control have focused on the coercive implications of social citizenship. Giroux argues that the development of social citizenship rights symbolised a shift from the political to the technical. By this he means that techniques of defining and delivering these rights introduced new levels of efficiency, surveillance, control - far removed from Greek ideal of educating for political participation.[4] Following a Foucauldian line,

Garland sees that new forms of welfare provision should be seen as being interlinked with new forms of punishment. From the 1880s onwards, a 'new penality' emerged which moved from a reliance on prohibition and penalty to a new mode of normalisation and new techniques of positive intervention to bring people into line.[5]

Feminist historians have analysed the restrictive effect which social rights legislation had upon definitions of women's citizenship. Welfare legislation from 1906 regulating pensions, unemployment benefit and national insurance was mediated through the nuclear family and emphasised the responsibilities of fathers and husbands. Female-centred benefits were explicitly accorded to women in their capacity as wives and mothers.[6] Pedersen summarises the effect of this; the fact that male citizenship entitlements in the emerging welfare state 'included the representation of women and children' meant that it was impossible for women and children to possess comparable rights.[7] Child welfare legislation from the late nineteenth century led to unprecedented levels of state intervention in social life, and was therefore a key platform of the emerging welfare state. However, children's rights as citizens of the mixed economy have not been fully addressed.

In arguing for a distinction to be drawn between social policy and social rights, Barbelet notes that Marshall ignores the possibility that welfare policy may not provide an enhancing status but that it is also likely to 'immobilise those subject to it.'[8] I want to explore the literal potential for immobilisation by looking at the incarceration of delinquent and neglected girls.

I will consider the experiences of girls admitted to industrial schools in the early 20th century. These institutions were set up in England and Wales in the 1850s for children under the age of 14 who had committed a criminal offence or who were in need of care. Although run by religious charities, the certification of the schools by the state signalled a transition within concepts of child protection from protection as an indiscriminate *gift* of charity to protection as a statutory *right*.[9] As these girls' experiences show, the 'right to be rescued' was often contentious.

Children and the 'right to be rescued'

In the course of the 19th century, children were accorded certain rights by welfare legislation which gradually constructed minimum standards of care - the right to be free from exploitation at work from the 1830s, the right to be educated from the 1870s, the right to be protected from sexual abuse and from neglect from the 1880s.[10] In 1908 the first Children Act brought together much of this disparate legislation under one umbrella. Popularly referred to as the Children's Charter, the Act signalled a new codification of children's rights which was further extended by the second Children Act of 1933. A new government sub-

department - the Children's Branch of the Home Office - was established in 1913 with the task of co-ordinating and monitoring the emerging system of statutory child welfare.[11]

Many saw that this expansion of statutory protectionist politics denoted the emergence of new model of collective citizenship. Sir George Newman, doctor and social commentator, believed that the civic conscience had been awakened as a response to 19th century by-products of laissez-faire: overcrowding, destitution, disease, and social neglect.[12] Newman, who served as the Chief Medical Inspector of [Elementary] Schools in the early 20th century, singled out the 'care of children' as 'the highest index and criterion of citizenship.' Just as the 'treatment of the insane became more humane', so 'the nurture of the child' had assumed 'new meaning'. The restriction of child labour and the introduction of new judicial, educational and welfare services for children meant that 'a better example of the growth of a sense of humanity could scarcely be chosen than this question of the care of the needy child.'[13]

However, such progressive narratives rarely questioned definitions of 'the needy child.' Many historians have argued that the above mentioned reforms re-defined childhood along firmly middle-class lines. As Zelizer argues, while compulsory education and restrictions on child labour signalled the emergence of the economically 'worthless' but emotionally 'priceless' child, this particular model of childhood was clearly class bound.[14] Poor families often depended upon their adolescent children's paid and unpaid work. Practices which had been traditional within working-class family life were re-cast as examples of poor parenting and neglect. Much of this class tension was played out in the courts. Prosecutions of parents for neglect soared into the thousands after 1880.[15] However, new protective legislation brought children as well their parents before the magistrates. Older children who defended their right to work by eschewing their right to attend school very often appeared in court for breaching new education and employment acts, as did those who willingly jeopardised their 'right to be cared for' by staying out late or by playing in the streets. Such children were regularly charged with 'being beyond parental control'.[16]

Re-evaluations of the risks facing children promoted safety as a social value.[17] Safety and risk were defined differently for boys and girls. The development of 'the right to be cared for' had a greater effect on girls than on boys since they were more commonly seen to be 'in need', and very often for lesser reasons. Analysing the dubious 'right to be rescued' allows a critique of existing feminist critiques of citizenship. As outlined above, feminist critiques have focused on the exclusion of women from political and social rights.[18] In this case, however, it could be argued that strenuous efforts were made to extend the right to be rescued to girls and young women in ways that restricted their personal and cultural freedom.

Admission patterns to girls' industrial schools bears this out. As I said, these schools were set up in the 1850s for children under the age of 14 who had committed a criminal offence or who were in need of care.[19] Evidence from Anglican and Jewish industrial schools shows that a higher proportion of girls than boys were admitted because they were thought to be in need of care. Unlike boys, girls were rarely sent to the schools because they had committed a criminal offence. Most were admitted as victims of various forms of parental neglect, or as a result of status offences. Within a sample of 80 cases which were admitted to Anglican and Jewish girls industrial schools between 1900 and 1934, only 15 girls appear to have committed a punishable offence.[20]

There is evidence to suggest that enforcing girls' right to be rescued severely compromised their own and, in some cases, their parents' freedoms. Extracts from one girl's case file demonstrates this in detail. Eleven year old Frances and her mother came under the investigation of a number of welfare agencies in 1923. It is not clear exactly what had instigated this, although Frances was known to have been sexually assaulted by a local man and her mother was suspected of poor parenting. Her father had been killed in the first world war, and as a war widow the mother received financial support from the Ministry of War Pensions. In addition to regular Ministry of Pensions checks on the family, NSPCC officers began reporting on them. The language of these reports shows how notions of 'need' and vulnerability were defined in opposition to 'client' wishes. One Ministry of Pensions report read as follows:

> This child lives with her mother and little brother in one room with one bed, which is shared by another woman. The women appear quite lacking insight regarding common decency. On two occasions when I visited the home the child's mother, was attired in one flimsy cotton garment and wore neither shoes nor stockings. The women are usually, one or both of them, in bed at midday though visitors of either sex are admitted.[21]

An NSPCC inspector made similar observations and added,

> I cannot say the mother leads a bad life, but from my own observations she is lax in her ideas of morals and ordinary decency...She also dresses in a smart way herself and her appearance is not at all in keeping with a widow with 2 children to support on 16/- a week pension.[22]

Frances' mother agreed to send her 'voluntarily' to a Church of England industrial school in Oxfordshire on the understanding, as she thought, that once she was able to provide a better home for her daughter they would be re-united. However, in this case it proved very difficult for the mother to prove that she was fit to care for her children and it was some years before Frances was 'released' from voluntary care. Frances' case shows how poor lifestyles - not to

mention unorthodox all-female households - were seen to endanger girls much more than boys by exposing them to moral and sexual risk. For girls, material deprivation was culturally associated with moral deterioration.

This trend continued into the 1930s, and was encouraged by the 1933 Children Act, which raised the age of a young person from 16 to 17 and therefore extended juvenile justice jurisdiction to a much wider range of adolescents. These and other measures encouraged less specific definitions of challenging behaviour and vulnerability, which had a major impact upon the policing of girls thereafter.[23]

Industrial schools were amalgamated with reformatory schools in 1933 to form 'new' approved schools. In 1936, more girls were admitted to approved schools as a result of status offences (51 per cent), than as a result of committing criminal offences (40 per cent), a trend which was to continue (see table and pie-chart).[24] Boys did appear in court under these sections, but these cases accounted for only 10 per cent of boys' approved school admissions in 1936.[25]

Girls' deviance and vulnerability was being re-defined. In the 1946 Home Office film, *Children on Trial*, the 'typical' delinquent girl was 15 year old 'Shirley Reynolds' who appears before the juvenile court and is sent to an approved school for 'running away from home and associating with men.'[26] Older adolescent 'girls' who were believed to be behaving inappropriately and prematurely as 'women' became a new target for juvenile justice regulation - a development which stretched the youth justice system to its limits and also did much to create the lasting impression that girls were 'more difficult' to deal with than boys.[27]

Concluding comment for first section

It is difficult to say whether Frances and these other girls would have been better left at home. The point here is that the extension of progressive rights to children was not uncomplicated.

Citizenship and industrial schools

As suggested above, the establishment of industrial schools represented new departures in both social policy and constructions of citizenship. The first section of this paper has considered the gendered development of the right to be rescued. In the second part, I want briefly to explore the nature of citizenship as promoted within the industrial schools. In examining the experience of these children as objects of policy, I will focus on the problems of delivering statutory minimum standards of care to children within an essentially voluntary system, and on the conscious creation of second-class citizens.

The children who were admitted to industrial schools in order to 'rescue' them from their unfit families often faced poor conditions in their new surroundings. On becoming certified schools, children's homes had to agree to abide by basic Home Office regulations which set minimum standards of care for children, covering everything from diet, working hours, education, cubic sleeping space, medical inspection and clothing to outside contact and licensing. However, the fact that the schools were allowed to 'modify' these rules compromised uniformity.[28] Lack of alternative accommodation meant that certificates were rarely withdrawn from institutions which failed to comply. These differences in standards led to an almost constant battle between certain schools and inspectors - statutory standards were hard to enforce within an under-funded voluntary system which relied heavily on local goodwill.[29]

Similarly, children's right to elementary education as established by the 1870 Forster Act was often ignored by school managers who very often relied on pupil-inmate labour and who rarely employed certified teachers. Older girls were especially likely to be removed from formal schooling early so that they could undertake more domestic work in the industrial school. Those that were taught within the industrial schools received a raw deal. Before 1948, special education committees dealt with any children who were not attending mainstream elementary schools. Hence, delinquent and neglected children were bracketed with feebleminded, pauper and sick children, and received a poor basic education as a result. Their designation as 'special' by local education authorities meant that even less was expected from pupils who were already believed to have below average intelligence.[30]

Those who received elementary schooling either within or outside their industrial school may have experienced instruction in citizenship through the teaching of civics or history. However, their sense of place in the community was conveyed much more effectively by the labour routines of the school and by their status as 'different', 'difficult' or 'deprived'. Stephen Heathorn has raised the issue of the contradictions of constructing an inclusive but differential civic identity for working class children.[31] These contradictions were even more profound in relation to delinquent or neglected working class children.[32]

Girls' 'training' was dominated by domestic work. From the 1850s to at least the 1940s, girls' certified schools depended upon unpaid inmate labour for their day to day running and reproduction. Girls cleaned, cooked, washed, gardened and supervised younger children. Some schools put these skills to commercial use and functioned as commercial laundries.[33] The dominance of domestic labour was a source of contention in the early twentieth century. Voluntary managers of the schools argued that the work was essential for the school economy and central to the girls' training for the life of domestic service for which they were almost all destined. Statutory inspectors, however, saw it as exploitative and as limiting

girls' prospects. However, the inability of 'progressives' within the statutory services either to find more funding for the managers, or alternatives forms of 'after-care' and employment - given an ongoing shortage of servants - meant that traditions of domestic work continued in the girls' schools into the 1950s.

While boys' training was not generally of a high standard, they were placed in a much wider range of jobs than girls when they left the school. In the mid 1920s, boys are recorded as entering over 20 manual and skilled trades, though overwhelmingly entered the military.[34] Models of social retraining were thus defined differently for boys and for girls. Contrary to Bailey's view, young offenders were not uniformly reclaimed for citizenship. The difference centred on issues of dependence and independence. Although time spent in the armed forces represented a continuing dependence, young men were ultimately prepared to lead independent lives. They were certainly not subject to the same degree of regulation as girls whilst on licence from the schools or after their discharge.

Girls' reform, on the other hand, was firmly tied to a philosophy of economic and social dependency. Trained only for domestic work, many became trapped in low-wage domestic service, dependent on their work for accommodation in the absence of higher wages, and encouraged to rely on marriage for security. Girls were trained to be employable, but only in a sphere of work which preserved their dependence within a family structure and which was therefore believed to guard against future delinquent episodes. The schools consciously perceived citizenship for both boys and girls in terms of social utility. However, in terms of wider social status, there was a world of difference between military service and domestic service. Reformed boys could serve their country. Reformed girls could serve below stairs in middle class households.

Conclusions

Viewing industrial schools through the lens of social citizenship raises some significant questions. Patterns of girls' admissions show how the statutory 'right' of children to be 'rescued' was gendered. Experiences of girls within the schools show, firstly, how difficult it was for the state to guarantee minimum standards of care, and secondly, how restricted notions of female citizenship were used to justify the limited training they received. Finally the zealous enforcement of girls' 'right to be rescued' was a key means by which the social emancipation of young women was continually deferred.

[1] S Heathorn 'Class and masculinity in narratives of English citizenship in the elementary schoolroom, c1880-1914' unpubl paper presented at AERA Annual Conference, Chicago, Mar 1997

[2] This paper is drawn from my PhD thesis, P Cox 'Rescue and reform: girls, delinquency and industrial schools 1908-1933' University of Cambridge 1997

[3] Marshall himself was prepared to concede that social rights are not able to be achieved through social policy if people are ignorant of their entitlements, but believed that more accessible welfare policies could overcome this difficulty. TH Marshall *Social Policy in the Twentieth Century* 1975 206-7. See also TH Marshall *Citizenship and Social Class* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1950

[4] Discussed in M Arnot et al 'Teachers, Gender and the Discourses of Citizenship' *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 1996 6:1

[5] D Garland *Punishment and Welfare: a history of penal strategies* Aldershot: Gower 1985

[6] For early work on this area see J Lewis *The politics of motherhood: child and maternal welfare 1900-1939* London: Croom Helm 1980; H Rose 'Rereading Titmuss: the sexual division of welfare' *Journal of Social Policy* 1981 10:4 477-502; G Pascall *Social policy: A feminist analysis* London: Tavistock 1986. For most recent work see, S Pedersen 'Gender, welfare and citizenship in Britain during the Great War' *American Historical Review* 1990 95:4 983-1006; G Bock and P Thane ed *Maternity and gender politics: women and the rise of the European welfare states 1880s-1950s* London: Routledge 1991; S Pedersen *Family, dependence, and the origins of the welfare state: Britain and France, 1914-1945* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1993; S Koven and S Michel ed *Mothers of a new world; maternalist politics and the origins of welfare states* NY and London: Routledge 1993; J Lewis 'Gender, the family and women's agency in the building of 'welfare states': the British case' *Social History* 1994 19:1 37-55; D Sainsbury ed *Gendering welfare states* London: Sage 1994

[7] Pedersen 'Gender, welfare and citizenship in Britain during the Great War' p984

[8] JM Barbalet 'Citizenship, class inequality and resentment' ch 3 in B Turner ed *Citizenship and social theory* London: Sage 1993 p54

[9] A Vincent and R Plant *Philosophy, politics and citizenship* Oxford: Blackwell 1984 p99 make this point in relation to the Charity Organisation Society's policies.

[10] See R Cooter ed *In the name of the child: health and welfare 1880-1940* London: Routledge 1992 and H Hendrick *Child welfare. England 1872-1989* London: Routledge 1994 for different types of state provision for children.

[11] J Clarke 'Managing the delinquent: the Children's Branch of the Home Office, 1913-30' in M Langan and B Schwarz ed *Crises in the British state 1880-1930* London: Hutchinson and CCCS 1985

[12] Sir George Newman *Citizenship and the Survival of Civilisation* New Haven: Yale University Press 1928 p29 (the book is from a series of Yale Lectures on the 'Responsibilities of Citizenship'). Also, CS Loch of the Charity Organisation Society saw industrial schools, along with prison and housing reform, as explicit evidence of the transition to models of social citizenship sponsored by the state, rather than by charities alone. CS Loch *Charity Organisation and Social Life* London 1910 367-8

[13] Newman *Citizenship* p85-86

[14] VA Zelizer *Pricing the priceless child: the changing social value of children* USA: Basic Books 1985 p3 and p12

[15] See H Ferguson 'Cleveland in history: The abused child and child protection 1880-1914' in Cooter ed *In the name of the child*

[16] See Cox 'Rescue and reform' ch2

[17] This idea is explored in H Roberts, SJ Smith and C Bryce *Children at risk?: safety as a social value* Buckingham: Open University Press 1995

[18] See C Pateman *The sexual contract* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1988; C Pateman *The Disorder of Women: democracy, feminism and political theory* Cambridge: Polity 1989; C Pateman and E Gross *Feminist Challenges; social and political theory* Sydney: Allen and Unwin 1986. Many other writers draw on Pateman's work.

[19] The need for care was determined in three ways: by a magistrate's decision that child welfare legislation had been breached, by parents' decision to commit their children to industrial schools and, more rarely, by children's own decision to refer themselves. Admissions could either be formally ordered by a magistrate or, crucially, be voluntary or informal.

[20] Of 41 Church of England Waifs and Strays Society industrial school personal case histories I have studied, only nine include any evidence to suggest that the girls who were admitted to industrial schools (1900-1934) had themselves committed an offence. In all nine cases, the offence was petty theft - of clothes, money, purses and fruit from shops, teachers, parents and other children - which was actually charged as larceny in only four cases. Ch Soc cases 12, 16, 25, 26 and 31. In addition, cases 9, 11, 17 and 29 were charged with larceny. The majority of the 41 cases were admitted as a result of their status as neglected or morally endangered.
Admissions of Jewish girls to Montefiore House - an industrial school which admitted only Jewish girls - were of a similar nature. Of the 39 cases admitted in selected years (1920-1934), only six were obviously 'criminal'; five involved petty theft and one was a case of attempted suicide. Hartley MS173.2/8/11 Montefiore House admissions register 1919-1938. Years studied: 1920, 1921, 1930, 1934. Theft cases: 155, 157, 159, 162, 166, 240

[21] Ch Soc case 6 Account of the Child by Miss Evelyn Stickney, Officer at the Ministry of Pensions, No 7 Area Office, Hull.

[22] Ch Soc case 6 Copy of NSPCC summary of the case by H Wallison, Inspector addressed to Chief Area Officer, Ministry of Pensions, Hull 22 June 1923

[23] The 1933 Act replaced the old poor-law derived neglect categories of the 1908 Act with two new, broader categories of neglect: 'being beyond control' and 'being in need of care or protection.'

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[24] Fifth Report on the Work of the Children's Branch, 1938 p38. Girls accounted for half of all approved school admissions made under the 'care or protection' and 'beyond control' categories between 1934 and 1936. Exact figures for girls; 1934 = 50 per cent; 1935 = 51 per cent; 1936 = 49 per cent

[25] Ibid table 12 p142

[26] Reviewed by Anon *Monthly Film Bulletin of the British Film Institute* 31 Aug 1946 13:152 p107

[27] L Gelsthorpe *Sexism and the Female Offender: An Organisational Analysis* Aldershot: Gower 1989

[28] 1908 Children Act section 54 allowed this.

[29] For example, three years after the Stafford Industrial Home had become a certified girls' school in 1916, Home Office inspectors' repeated requests for an improved fire escape had still not been met. Criticism of schools' failure to maintain standard medical or anthropometrical records was met in the same case with the simple resignation of the one Home's unpaid honorary doctor. PRO MH102.144 Stafford Industrial Home 1916-1919

[30] This directly informed definitions of 'suitable' training. A 1902 report noted that 'these children will lead upstanding, not sedentary lives, and will have to earn their bread rather by sweat of brow than stress of intellect', OP3100.4.26 *Account of the Reformatory and Industrial Schools of Great Britain* London 1904 p18. Little had changed by 1966, when a Home Office staff recruitment booklet advised that 'the emphasis [of approved schools] is on social re-education first, and classroom education second', R Adams *Careers in Approved Schools* London: HMSO 1966 p5

[31] Heathorn 'Class and masculinity'. Further, the new 'politics of conscience' within which the development of the schools ought to be located rested upon the duty of the fortunate to minister to the less fortunate. As Bailey notes, this form of citizenship made demands on the privileged. However, it also perpetuated a distinct power relation between the privileged and the underprivileged. Within this model, delinquent and neglected children were very much the objects rather than the agents of social action. See V Bailey *Delinquency and citizenship: reclaiming the young offender 1914-1948* Oxford: Clarendon 1987p2 and M Richter *The politics of conscience: TH Green and his age* London 1964

[32] To many contemporary commentators who were comfortable with the social principles of selection and hierarchy, there was no contradiction. Barrister and academic James Garnett saw the rationing and channelling of state educational expenditure as a key part of the promotion of effective citizenship. Given that 'educational, as well as economic, considerations forbid the provision of a uniform system of education', he urged selection and classification in education. 'The qualities that serve the greater ends of the race will be cherished and increased; the sorts of men and women that have these qualities least will be made to understand the necessary restraints of their limitations.' JCM Garnett *Education and World Citizenship: An Essay Towards a Science of Education* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1921 p321-322

[33] Stafford and Sunderland schools

[34] Third Report of the Work of the Children's Branch 1925 Appendices Table 6 Occupations entered by boys and girls on discharge from certified schools 1922-24. Lists for boys; armed forces, mercantile marine, clerks, shop assistants, skilled trades (mechanics, carpenters, printers, painters, bakers, tailors, shoemakers, gardeners, metal workers), miners, factory hands, domestic service, motor drivers, messengers and porters, farm hands, labourers, carmen. By contrast, over 70 per cent of girls entered various forms of domestic service, while a handful of girls were listed as becoming clerks, typists, dressmakers, teachers, waitresses, and factory hands.

Fig 5e. Types of court orders issued under 1933 Children Act resulting in admission to Approved Schools during 1936

Girls	Approved schools				
	Senior	Junior	Total orders	% of girls' orders	% of total orders
Section 57	99	130	229	40.1%	6.1%
Sections 62 and 64	151	141	292	51.1%	7.8%
Sections 66, 84(8), 85	21	14	35	6.1%	0.9%
Sections 58, 65, 3rd sched	2	13	15	2.6%	0.4%
Total girls' approved school orders	273	298	571		15.2%

Boys	Approved schools					
	Senior	Intermediate	Junior	Total orders	% of boys' orders	% of total orders
Section 57	1206	778	726	2710	85.0%	72.1%
Sections 62 and 64	95	77	139	311	9.8%	8.3%
Sections 66, 84(8), 85	21	4	21	46	1.4%	1.2%
Sections 58, 65, 3rd sched	2	40	79	121	3.8%	3.2%
Total boys' approved school orders	1324	899	965	3188		84.8%

Source: Fifth report of the Children's Branch 1938, table 12 p142

Key to sections of 1933 Children Act featured in tables

Section 57: offences committed by children or young persons.

Section 62: in need of care and protection because of unsatisfactory home etc.

Section 64: beyond control

Section 65: refractory Poor Law child

Section 66: unsatisfactory whilst under a supervision order.

Section 84(8) & Section 85: unsatisfactory whilst under care of a fit person

Section 58: on conviction of manslaughter

3rd schedule: breaking school attendance order

Fig 5e cont. Types of court orders issued under 1933 Children Act resulting in admission to Approved Schools during 1936